RESPONSE

This is a response to the Office Action dated July 23, 2008. Claims 51-55, 57-66, 68, 70-88, 90-98, 102, 104-107 and 109-114 stand rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pub. 2003/0046161 ("Kamangar"), in view of U.S. Pub. 2004/0143569 ("Gross"), and further in view of U.S. Pub. 2003/0149938 ("McElfresh"). Claims 64, 70 and 80 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamangar, in view of Gross, in further view of McElfresh, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,714,975 ("Aggarwal"). Claims 71 and 81 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamangar, in view of Gross, in further view of McElfresh and Aggarwal, and further in view of U.S. Pub. 2004/0186776 ("Llach"). Claims 101 and 103 stand rejected over 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamangar in view of Gross, in further view of McElfresh, in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 7,246,312 ("Harnngton"). Claim 108 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

The rejections and objections from the Office Action of July 23, 2008 are discussed below. No new matter has been added. Claims 51, 53, 54, 77, 85, 86, 90, 92, and 96 have been amended for clarity. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

I.   **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

   A. Claims 51-55, 57-66, 68, 70-88, 90-98, 102, 104-107 and 109-114

   Claims 51-55, 57-66, 68, 70-88, 90-98, 102, 104-107 and 109-114 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamangar, in view of Gross, and in further view of McElfresh.

   Kamangar relates to "a more effective advertising system which orders ads an [sic] a manner that maximizes both their relevance and their economic values…by ad price information and ad performance information." Kamangar, ¶12. Thus, Kamangar does not teach valuing page components "based on a relevance of each respective page component to a context of the web page," as claimed in independent claims 51, 77, and 90. Furthermore, content, links and search results can not be valued based on ad price information nor ad performance information, thus, Kamangar does not disclose any method for valuing "a non-advertising content," as claimed in independent claims 51, 77, and 90. The Office Action acknowledges that Kamangar fails to

14

expressly disclose "at least one different page component comprising non-advertising content." Office Action of July 23, 2008, p. 5.

Gross relates to a system for "searching, index, and presenting information." Gross, ¶30. Gross discloses scoring "the relevancy of each found document or file." Gross, ¶82. The scores of the documents of Gross are based on the relevancy of the found documents to search terms. Gross, ¶82. Thus, the scores of the documents in Gross are not "based on a relevance of each respective page component to a context of the web page," as claimed in independent claims 51, 77, and 90. Furthermore Gross does not disclose a system that selects "at least one component in the selected subset comprises an advertisement and at least one different component in the selected subset comprises a non-advertising content," **based on an actual value** of the web page, advertisement and the non-advertising content, as claimed in independent claims 51, 77, and 90.

McElfresh relates to a system for "optimizing placement of ads on a webpage." McElfresh discloses "[a] generalized content block 42 is shown in the right-center of the page 40" and "[i]n addition, the peripheral blocks for placement of ads, or topic tiles, are arranged in order to maximize revenue generation for the webpage," thus the content is not included in the arrangement to maximize revenue generation. McElfresh, ¶33. McElfresh does not disclose a system that selects "at least one page component comprising an advertisement" and "at least one page component comprising a non-advertising content," where "the respective actual value of each respective page component is based on a relevance of each respective page component to a context of the web page," as claimed in independent claims 51, 77, and 90.

Kamangar, McElfresh and Gross fail to disclose determining a nominal value based on "a demographic profile of the user," as claimed in claim 61, 83, and 93. The Examiner states that "Kamangar discloses this limitation in that the system comprises a centralized database that stores personal information about users." Office Action of July 23, 2008, page 14. However, storing personal information is not disclosed in Kamangar, not even in the specific paragraph referenced by the Examiner.

Furthermore, Kamangar, McElfresh and Gross also fail to disclose determining the nominal value based on "a geographic location of the user," as claimed in claim 62. The Examiner states "Kamangar discloses this limitation in that the system comprises a centralized database that stores zip codes of users." Office Action of July 23, 2008, page 15. However, Kamangar does not disclose storing zip codes of the users. In fact the words "zip code" do not

appear anywhere in Kamangar. Thus, Kamangar does not disclose determining the nominal value based on "a geographic location of the user," as claimed in claim 62.

For the above-mentioned reasons, Kamangar, McElfresh and Gross also fail to disclose determining "the respective actual value of each respective page component placed on the web page is determined irrespective of a relevance of each respective page component to a search query," as claimed in claims 53, 85, and 92. Also for the above-mentioned reasons, Kamangar, McElfresh, and Gross fail to disclose determining the "actual value of each respective page component is based on a relevance of each respective page component to the other page components on the web page," as claimed in claims 54 and 86.

Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claims 51, 77, and 90, and all claims that depend thereon, are patentable over Kamangar in view of Gross, further in view of McElfresh, because Kamangar, Gross, and McElfresh, alone or in combination, fail to disclose all of the elements of independent claims 51, 77 and 90.

B. Claims 64, 70, and 80

Dependent claims 64, 70, and 80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamangar, in view of Gross, in further view of McElfresh, and in further view of Aggarwal. As stated above, Kamangar, Gross, and, McElfresh fail to teach a system that selects "at least one page component comprising an advertisement" and "at least one page component comprising a non-advertising content," **based on an actual value** of the web page, advertisement and the non-advertising content, as claimed. Furthermore, Kamangar, Gross, and McElfresh fail to teach determining the actual value of each page component based on "based on a relevance of each respective page component to a context of the web page," as claimed in independent claim 51, 77 and 90.

Aggarwal relates to "a method for placing advertisements [sic] web pages." Aggarwal, Col. 2, line 51. Aggarwal discloses that "a primary object of the present invention is to provide a method for dynamically assigning advertisements to appropriate slots on appropriate web pages." Aggarwal, Col. 2, ll. 33-35. Aggarwal does not teach a system that selects "at least one page component comprising an advertisement" and "at least one page component comprising a non-advertising content," **based on an actual value** of the web page, advertisement and the non-advertising content, as claimed in independent claims 51, 77, and 90. Furthermore, Aggarwal does not teach determining an a actual value of each respective page component "based on a

relevance of each respective page component to a context of the web page," as claimed in independent claims 51, 77, and 90. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 64, 70, and 80 are allowable over Kamangar, in view of Gross, in further view of McElfresh, and in further view of Aggarwal, because Kamangar, Gross, McElfresh, and Aggarwal, alone or in combination, do not disclose all the elements of the independent claims from which they depend.

C. Claims 71 and 81

Dependent claims 71 and 81 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamangar, in view of Gross, in further view of McElfresh and Aggarwal, and further in view of Llach. As stated above, Kamangar, Gross, McElfresh and Aggarwal fail to disclose a system that selects "at least one page component comprising an advertisement" and "at least one page component comprising a non-advertising content," **based on an actual value** of the web page, advertisement and the non-advertising content, as claimed. Furthermore, Kamangar, Gross, and McElfresh fail to teach determining the actual value of each page component based on "based on a relevance of each respective page component to a context of the web page," as claimed in independent claim 51, 77 and 90. Llach relates to "a system and method for generating and selecting targeted advertising using price metrics." Llach, ¶2. Llach discloses that "[t]he targeted advertisement 110 is then selected or generated, embedded within the Web page 100', transmitted to the user's system, and displayed on the user's system along with the results of the user's request to the search engine, a list of Web sites," indicating that search results are not included in the advertisement selection. Llach does not teach a system that "at least one page component comprising an advertisement" and "at least one page component comprising a non-advertising content," **based on an actual value** of the web page, advertisement and the non-advertising content, as claimed in independent claims 51, 77, and 90. Furthermore, Llach does not teach determining the actual value of each page component based on "based on a relevance of each respective page component to a context of the web page," as claimed in independent claim 51, 77 and 90. Applicants submit claims 71 and 81 are allowable because Kamangar, Gross, McElfresh, Aggarwal and Llach, alone or in combination, fail to disclose all of the elements of the independent claims from which they depend.

D. Claims 101 and 103

Claims 101 and 103 stand rejected over 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamangar in view of Gross, in further view of McElfresh, in further view of Harnngton. The

Office Action acknowledges that Kamangar, Gross and McElfresh fail to teach using a mathematical model incorporating the areas occupied by components on the web page. Office Action of July 23, 2008, page 39. Harnngton relates to "specifying a custom document as a constraint optimization problem." Harnngton, col. 3, ll. 32-33. Harnngton teaches, "areas of the document to be filled with content are modeled as problem variables." Harnngton, col. 3, ll. 49-50. Harnngton does not teach "using a mathematical model based on the areas occupied by the page components on the web page and a total area of the web page," as claimed in claims 101 and 103. Applicants submit claims 101 and 103 are allowable because Kamangar, Gross, McElfresh, and Harnngton, alone or in combination, fail to disclose all of the elements of the independent claims from which they depend.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the references cited by the Examiner, Kamangar, McElfresh, Aggarwal and Llach, relate to systems for valuing advertisements, such as through ad price information and ad performance information, not based on the relevance of the advertisements to the context of the web page or to each other. Gross relates to scoring documents results based on the relevancy of the documents, not based on the context of the web page or the other documents. None of the references cited by the Examiner relate to systems for building web pages based on valuing non-advertising page components, such as non-advertising content, in addition to advertisements, based on a relevance of the components to the context of the web page as claimed in independent claims 51, 77, and 90. Thus, Applicants submit that the independent claims 51, 77, and 90, and all claims which depend thereon, are allowable over Kamangar, Gross, McElfresh, Aggarwal, and Llach, alone or in combination, because none of the references disclose all of the elements of the independent claims.

II.　ALLOWABLE CLAIMS

Claim 108 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would otherwise be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claim 108 would be allowable. However, as dependent claim 108 depends from independent claim 77, dependent claim 108 should be allowed for the reasons set forth above for independent claim 77. Applicants therefore request that the Examiner withdraw this objection to this claim.

CONCLUSION

Each of the rejections in the Office Action dated July 23, 2008 has been addressed and no new matter has been added. Applicants submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and notice to this effect is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned if it would expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

November 24, 2008   /Michael G. Dreznes/
Date   Michael G. Dreznes
                             Registration No. 59,965

                             Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200